

chairman of the committee, cut off my remarks and forced through the vote on Vanita Gupta, all so he could save 1 week to get her confirmed—just 1 week.

I said right here at this desk 9 months ago that when our rules and our traditions are so flagrantly breached, there has to be some kind of consequence, and I outlined exactly what that consequence would be at the time: that I would not expedite consideration, as the Senator from Illinois rightly observes is the custom here, for any U.S. attorney nominee from a State represented by a Democrat on the Judiciary Committee because if there are not consequences when rules and traditions are breached in this institution, we will soon not have rules and traditions.

Now, I also said that if the Senator from Illinois would simply express regret for what happened that day and pledge that it wouldn't happen again, I would be happy to let all of these nominees move forward. We have communicated this to the Senator from Illinois and his staff on multiple occasions. I reiterated today that I would be happy to confirm these nominees in the following few minutes if the Senator from Illinois would simply express regret for what happened in the hearing that day and commit that it won't happen again, which, I say again, is simply committing that we follow our own rules. If we hear that from the Senator from Illinois, we will have five new U.S. attorneys.

And I see the Senators from Rhode Island and Hawaii and New Jersey are here. As the Senator from Illinois said, I have no objection to moving forward with any of these particular nominees. All these States can have their U.S. attorneys this afternoon, but if not, I will have to continue to insist that we not expedite these nominations. So I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MARKEY). Objection is heard.

The Senator from Illinois.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I have been trying to understand the Republican objection to these well-qualified U.S. attorney nominees, and the Senator from Arkansas has made it clear. It has nothing to do with them; it is about me.

He, obviously, doesn't approve of what happened one day in the committee. And the price to be paid is not by me but by the U.S. attorneys, well-qualified, who have important jobs to fill.

One member of the Republican caucus is upset with the fact that back in March—this happened in March—the Judiciary Committee moved to vote on the nomination of Vanita Gupta to be Associate Attorney General when Republican members of the committee had not finished speaking on her nomination.

He correctly remembers that he was speaking at approximately 10 minutes to 12 p.m., when I interrupted him,

took a rollcall vote, and went back to him if he wished to speak again.

I will be the first to acknowledge that I moved forward with the vote on Ms. Gupta's nomination over the objections of committee Republicans. But put simply, the Republicans forced my hand that day.

The Senator from Arkansas talks about courtesy in this body. I will tell him I think that it should be a hallmark of what we all do at all times. I am fortunate, truly blessed, in my mind, to have, as the ranking member of the Senate Judiciary Committee, a real friend in CHUCK GRASSLEY, the Republican Senator of Iowa.

I asked him that day what was going on. I had informed the committee in writing that we would proceed with a vote on Ms. Gupta that day. I then allowed committee Republicans to speak for 94 minutes on Ms. Gupta's nomination, even though much of what was said was repetitive—some false and some really unwarranted.

I was, in fact, prepared to allow committee Republicans to speak for as long as they wished. I turned to Senator GRASSLEY and said: "What's the plan here?" And he said: "Well, Senator TILLIS may return and speak, and we just have these members speaking."

I had received assurances that the Republicans would not use an obscure Senate rule, the 2-hour rule, to cut off the markup before we voted on Ms. Gupta's nomination. But at 11:55 a.m., I was surprised, as was Senator GRASSLEY, to be informed that despite their earlier assurances, a Republican Senator had, in fact, invoked the 2-hour rule in an effort to prevent Ms. Gupta's nomination from being considered that day and to close down the markup in the committee.

My hand was forced by this action. It was a surprise move, a tactical move, surely within the rules for them to make, but I did exactly what previous Republican chairs of the Judiciary Committee did in similar situations. I ended the debate and called for the vote on the nomination.

If you are listening to this and wondering what these arcane committee procedures have to do with U.S. attorney nominations, you are not alone. The Senator is pleading that we should stand by the traditions of the Senate. And by the traditions of the Senate, these U.S. attorney nominees would go through by unanimous consent. That is a tradition of the Senate as well.

The simple answer is, what happened with the markup debate more than 8 months ago has nothing to do with these five fine individuals or with any other U.S. attorney nominee who may come before the Senate.

If the Senator from Arkansas wants me to publicly express my regret for this occurrence, I express that regret. But I want to make it clear, I relied on my friend Senator GRASSLEY. We were both surprised to know that someone had invoked the 2-hour rule. Caught by surprise, I did what other Republican chairs of the committee have done.

I don't believe we should play politics with critical law enforcement nominations. They are putting our communities at risk and politicizing law enforcement in a way that threatens public safety.

If we are going to truly stand up for law and order, let these men and women go to work across America representing the Department of Justice.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arkansas.

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, I would like to address the Chair with a question to the Senator from Illinois.

I appreciate those comments. I would observe that since that day, we have not had a similar circumstance in which any Republican wishing to speak was cut off in a markup.

Can we simply have a commitment that that will not happen again in the future, as it hasn't happened in the last 9 months?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Illinois.

Mr. DURBIN. Responding through the Chair, as long as there is openness and honesty about what is happening in the procedure, I will assure you that I will do everything I can to extend that courtesy forward.

That particular day, you may or may not be aware of the fact that while you were speaking, we learned—Senator GRASSLEY and I both learned that someone had raised the 2-hour rule, and it came as a surprise to both of us.

When we are open and honest about what we are trying to achieve in a committee, there is no reason why we can't abide by basic courtesy in the tradition of the Senate.

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, I appreciate the remarks from the Senator of Illinois. I will invite him to make his unanimous consent request again. I do not intend to object further. And a voice vote is fine.

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate consider the following nominations en bloc: Calendar Nos. 534, No. 535, No. 536, No. 581, and No. 582; that the Senate vote on the nominations en bloc without intervening action or debate; that the motions to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table with no intervening action or debate; that any statements related to the nominations be printed in the Record; and that the President be immediately notified of the Senate's action.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The Senate will proceed to the nominations en bloc.

The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the following nominations en bloc: Clare E. Connors, of Hawaii, to be United States Attorney for the District of Hawaii for the term of four years; Zachary A. Cunha, of Rhode Island, to be United States Attorney for the District of Rhode Island

for the term of four years; Nikolas P. Kerest, of Vermont, to be United States Attorney for the District of Vermont for the term of four years; Gregory K. Harris, of Illinois, to be United States Attorney for the Central District of Illinois for the term of four years; and Philip R. Sellinger, of New Jersey, to be United States Attorney for the District of New Jersey for the term of four years?

The nominations were confirmed en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The President will be immediately notified of the Senate's action.

The Senator from Rhode Island.

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. Mr. President, I just want to thank my colleague Senator COTTON and my chairman Senator DURBIN for the way in which that resolved itself. For a minute, we actually feel like a Senate here.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Ms. SMITH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

VOTE ON MAGNUS NOMINATION

The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the Magnus nomination?

Ms. SMITH. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from Vermont (Mr. LEAHY) is necessarily absent.

Mr. THUNE. The following Senators are necessarily absent: the Senator from Arkansas (Mr. COTTON) and the Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. LANKFORD).

The result was announced—yeas 50, nays 47, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 483 Ex.]

YEAS—50

Baldwin	Heinrich	Reed
Bennet	Hickenlooper	Rosen
Blumenthal	Hirono	Sanders
Booker	Kaine	Schatz
Brown	Kelly	Schumer
Cantwell	King	Shaheen
Cardin	Klobuchar	Sinema
Carper	Lujan	Smith
Casey	Manchin	Stabenow
Collins	Markey	Tester
Coons	Menendez	Van Hollen
Cortez Masto	Merkley	Warner
Duckworth	Murphy	Warnock
Durbin	Murray	Warren
Feinstein	Ossoff	Whitehouse
Gillibrand	Padilla	Wyden
Hassan	Peters	

NAYS—47

Barrasso	Burr	Crapo
Blackburn	Capito	Cruz
Blunt	Cassidy	Daines
Boozman	Cornyn	Ernst
Braun	Cramer	Fischer

Graham	Marshall	Scott (FL)
Grassley	McConnell	Scott (SC)
Hagerty	Moran	Shelby
Hawley	Murkowski	Sullivan
Hoeben	Paul	Thune
Hyde-Smith	Portman	Tillis
Inhofe	Risch	Toomey
Johnson	Romney	Tuberville
Kennedy	Rounds	Wicker
Lee	Rubio	Young
Lummis	Sasse	

NOT VOTING—3

Cotton	Lankford	Leahy
--------	----------	-------

The nomination was confirmed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. PETERS). Under the previous order, the motion to reconsider is considered made and laid upon the table and the President will be immediately notified of the Senate's action.

The majority leader.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, I move to proceed to legislative session.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion.

The motion was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Kentucky.

MOTION TO DISCHARGE

Mr. PAUL. Mr. President, I move to discharge S.J. Res. 31 from the Foreign Relations Committee.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The motion is pending.

Mr. PAUL. Mr. President, the most common cause of famine and starvation is war. Saudi Arabia's air and naval blockade of Yemen has led to thousands and thousands of deaths in Yemen from lack of food and medicine. The United States should end all arms sales to the Saudis until they end their blockade of Yemen.

President Biden said he would change the Trump policy of supporting Saudi's war in Yemen, but it is not all that apparent that policy has changed.

Today, we challenge the Biden administration's sale of \$650 million worth of arms, including air-to-air missiles in Yemen.

Just 2 months ago, the Biden administration approved \$500 million worth of arms, including maintenance for attack helicopters that are used in Yemen.

Some want to differentiate offensive weapons from defensive weapons, but, really, even defensive weapons can be used to allow a country to absorb attacks in order to continue their offensive operations.

The real question is not an artificial designation of weapons as offensive or defensive but whether Congress is serious about using the leverage of arms sales or withholding arms sales to end the blockade in Yemen.

That the Biden administration continues to reward Saudi Arabia with weapons seems to indicate that President Biden is not really serious about withholding arms sale to end the war in Yemen.

Indeed, if this administration were serious about ending the Saudi blockade, they could do one thing, and this thing would end the war tomorrow, would end the blockade tomorrow. The Saudis, I think, would immediately stop the blockade if this administration would stop sending spare parts and stop fixing the planes.

Bruce Reidel of Brookings writes that "the Saudi air force would be grounded in short order" if we quit sending them spare parts, quit repairing their aircraft. We could stop this war if we really had the will to do it.

All America should be appalled at the humanitarian disaster caused by the Saudi blockade of Yemen. For years now, ships that would otherwise carry food, fuel, and medicine are turned away by the Saudi-led coalition, depriving the Yemeni people of the necessities to sustain civilization.

Yemen is one of the poorest countries on the planet. They have to import their food. The blockade is killing their children.

Saudi Arabia's intervention in the Yemeni civil war is a chilling example of the cruelty of warfare by starvation. According to the United Nations, in Yemen 5 million people are one step away from succumbing to famine and disease, and 10 million more are right behind them.

We can start the process of ending this crisis by enacting this resolution of disapproval.

The children of Yemen who survive Saudi's barbaric blockade will inevitably tell their sons and daughters of the horrors of their youth, and those sons and daughters will tell their sons and daughters. Through oral tradition, a thousand generation of Yemenis will know of the Crown Prince's ruthlessness, and they will also know that it was the Americans who sold the weapons to wage this murderous campaign.

The reports from Yemen are literally a nightmare. The Washington Post reported recently of a 3-year-old boy who cannot walk or speak, who weighs 10 pounds—a 3-year-old boy who weighs 10 pounds. The images are grotesque. His face is "skeletal." His arms and legs are as "thin as twigs." He weighs 10 pounds. His father says that he sometimes goes days without any food.

And we are complicit. We are arming the Saudis and allowing this to happen. Offensive, defensive—they shouldn't get any of our weapons. We should stop selling them any weapons until they stop starving the country of Yemen.

The New York Times tells the story of a mother who, after 3 days of failing to get a ride, carried her 8-month-old while walking 2 hours to reach medics to treat her child's acute malnutrition. But even after a week of treatment with enriched formula, the boy still lay motionless on his hospital bed.

Tens of thousands of children have already died from disease and malnutrition from this war, and we should not be complicit. We should not be aiding the Saudis.